

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-50 presently stand rejected.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because the proper legends are missing. Applicants are attaching herewith four (4) sheets of annotated marked-up drawings. In order to obviate the Examiner's objection to the drawings, Applicants are amending the figure legends of Figs. 1, 2A, 2B and 3. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate approval of the drawings in the next paper from the office.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19-21, 23-33, 35-38, 40-46, and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (6,381,324) in view of Applebaum et al. (6,463,413).

Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (6,381,324) and Applebaum et al. (6,463,413) and further in view of S. Shaffer et al. (5,950,165).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (6,381,324) and Applebaum et al. (6,463,413) and further in view of Skladman et al. (6,438,215).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (6,381,324) and Applebaum et al. (6,463,413), and further in view of Porter (6,282,270).

Claims 10, 11, 16 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (6,381,324) and Applebaum et al. (6,463,413) and further in view of Cheston et al. (6,330,308).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (6,381,324), Applebaum et al. (6,463,413) and S. Shaffer et al. (5,950,165).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (6,381,324) and Applebaum et al. (6,463,413) and further in view of Swan et al. (6,351,222).

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (6,381,324) and Applebaum et al. (6,463,413) and further in view of Dauerer et al. (6,311,177).

Claims 24 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (6,381,324) and Applebaum et al. (6,463,413) and further in view of Vysotsky et al. (5,719,921).

For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests favorable disposition of the application.

Argument

All of the claims of the present application have been amended. Specifically, all of the independent claims, claims 1, 9, 29, 36 and 44, have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited prior art references.

In particular, as disclosed, for example, at page 10, line 5 through page 11, line 16, and claimed, in the present application, an exemplary system in accordance with the present invention is provided in which an electronic communications network, such as the Internet, is searched to find a matching telephone number to a new contact entry of an electronic address book. The name associated with the new contact is first verbally input to the system and recorded and a telephone number corresponding to the name is also obtained. The telephone

number is obtained, for example, by recording a verbally input form of the number. The telephone number is then used to search the communications network for a matching number. If a match is found, a name corresponding to the found number is compared to the recorded name of the new contact.

If more than one matching number is found on the network, the system loads all of the names associated with the matching numbers into an automatic speech recognizer (ASR) and plays the recorded name associated with the new contact as well as the names associated with the matching numbers found on the network. The system then determines if any of the names found on the network match the name played by the ASR. If a unique, i.e., only one, matching name is determined, the system collects all the available data associated with the found name and number from the network and enters it into the address book as additional data associated with the new contact. According to a further embodiment, a match with respect to the played names is determined by measuring the quality of the match between the originally recorded name and the loaded name(s) from the network and designating a match if the quality is above a certain threshold. Examples of the additional data found on the network are the contact's e-mail address, work phone number, home mailing address, etc.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, for example,

a textual directory unit for searching the electronic communications network to locate and select the contact data based on a telephone number corresponding to the new contact name, wherein the selected contact data is inserted into the personal address book associated with the user and wherein further, the selected contact data is data other than the new

contact name and the telephone number corresponding to the new contact name

Neither Shaffer et al. nor Applebaum et al. teach or suggest a textual directory as claimed. In particular, the asserted prior art references fail to teach or suggest a device that searches an electronic network and selects data other than an associated telephone number or name. Accordingly, claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon, specifically, claims 2-8 and 48-50 are patentable over the asserted combination of references.

Claim 9

Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*;

determining whether said at least one associated name matches said pronounced name; and

if one of the associated names matches said pronounced name, obtaining associated textual data other than the name and associated telephone number for the matching name and entering said matching name and the textual data into said PAB.

Neither Shaffer et al. nor Applebaum et al. teach or suggest determining a match based on a pronounced name and obtaining associated data other than the name and associated telephone number for the matching name. Accordingly, claim 9 and all claims dependent thereon, specifically, claims 10-28 are patentable over the asserted combination of references.

Claim 29

Claim 29 recites, *inter alia*;

(c) using the second identifying information to search the electronic communications network and find primary data that matches the second identifying information and secondary data that corresponds to the primary data;

(d) determining if the found primary data matches the recorded first identifying information of the new contact and, if so, storing the primary and secondary data in the address book.

Neither Shaffer et al. nor Applebaum et al. teach or suggest finding primary *and* secondary data associated with a found match for search identifying data. Accordingly, claim 29 and all claims dependent thereon, specifically, claims 30-35 and 39-43 are patentable over the asserted combination of references.

Claim 36

Claim 36 recites, *inter alia*;

- (a) recording a verbalized form of first identifying information corresponding to the new contact;
- (b) obtaining second identifying information, different than the first identifying information, corresponding to the new contact, wherein the second identifying information is obtained by recording a verbalized form of the second identifying information;
- (c) using the second identifying information to search an electronic communications network and select a data entry for which a portion of the data matches the second identifying information; and
- (d) copying contact information from the selected directory entry to the personal address book, wherein the copied contact information is other than the first and second identifying information.

Neither Shaffer et al. nor Applebaum et al. teach or suggest recording first identifying data, such as a name, of a new contact, searching a communications network, such as the Internet, for matches for second identifying data corresponding to the first identifying data, and copying contact information other than the first and second identifying data, that is contact information such as e-mail address, other telephone number, etc., into an address book.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appl. No. 09/774,088

Accordingly, claim 36 and all claims dependent thereon, specifically, claims 37 and 38 are patentable over the asserted combination of references.

Claim 44

Claim 44 recites, *inter alia*;

recording a pronunciation of a number associated with the name of the new contact;

converting the recorded number of the new contact to text form;
searching, via an electronic communications network, for contact data associated with the new contact, wherein the search is based on the text form of the recorded number of the new contact; and

storing contact data resulting from said searching into the personal database.

Neither Shaffer et al. nor Applebaum et al. teach or suggest recording the pronunciation of a number associated with a new contact name, converting the number into text data, searching an electronic network for contact data associated with the new contact based on the text form of the number associated with the new contact, and storing the contact data. Accordingly, claim 44 and all claims dependent thereon, specifically, claims 45-47 are patentable over the asserted combination of references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the application is believed to be in form for immediate allowance with claims 1-50, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to **contact the undersigned** at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/774,088

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kevin M. Barner", is written over a horizontal line.

Kevin M. Barner
Registration No. 46,075

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 19, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: Q61007